16th November 1922] [Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi]

place that the differences between the original and the draft of the present Bill are not fundamental in character. Secondly it would make consultation with public bodies impossible, if we are asked to go to them every time that we make some change out of regard for their views and if we are asked to make further references before arriving at a final conclusion, there would be no end to such a process. Moreover, we must not forget that the power of legislation rests with this Council and not with the Senate of the Madras University. With due deference to my hon. friend Mr. Patro, I should say that I deprecate the reference he made to private conferences. He quoted the views of certain bodies that were consulted privately. I rather think that as the proceedings of those conferences have not been published, it is an unfortunate reference.

" With regard to the principles of the Bill, the second head under which the criticisms may be classified, I must confess, the criticisms do not seem to adumbrate any alternative policy and are devoid of constructive significance. Some of my hon. friends are of opinion that no change is required. It is a most untenable position to take in view of all that has been stated and done regarding university reform during the last ten years and more. For a long time past, we have all been pleading for university reform. My hon. friend the Rev. Macphail will hold me guilty of having been the very first to demand reform in the Madras University. We all hailed with delight the publication of the Calcutta University Commmittee Report. The Senate itself set to work in order to see how far they would be benefited by the views expressed by the Sadler Committee. But the courage for reform on the part of some of my hon. friends opposite seems to have oozed away the moment this Bill was introduced and the call for action came.

" Again, it has been said and it has been said just now by my hon. friend Mr. Krishna Rao that the reforms should have been started at the circumference and gradually worked up to the centre. The analogy of Allahabad was quoted. But we are confronted with two difficulties which render the present step the only possible one that could be taken. The first is that the number of mufassal colleges in the Madras Presidency is much larger than in the United Provinces, and the simpler process therein followed could not have been followed here without relegating Madras to a very uncertain position. Secondly, Sir, we suffer from paucity of funds. With reference to Lucknow hon. Members must be aware that the landed aristocracy of the United Provinces found the greater part of the money required. It is a far more costlier affair to start a new university in one of the chief linguistic divisions than to bring about something of a real teaching university here, in Madras, by making a few adjustments not overcostly. If it was our view that no educational reform should have been attempted, then we could have laid the pious unction to our heart and without appearing to be hostile to reform, advocated the founding of universities on linguistic basis and taking up the question of the reorganization of the university thereafter. The Andhra University would cost several lakhs. And then if it is to be accompanied by a University of Trichinopoly that would have consumed some more lakhs. In that event we would not have any money to effect any reform in Madras. It is for this reason, that the situation in Madras is far more favourable to a development of this kind than in other places. It is not helpful to say

1 p. m.